

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/852,469	WIDROW, BERNARD	
	Examiner Dominic E. Rego	Art Unit 2684	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Dominic E. Rego. (3) _____.

(2) Michael Ananian. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 July 2006.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 15.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's attorney agreed to cancel group II which has only claims 11 and 14, select group I and III and cancelled claim 15 from group III. In group I and III, the independent claims 1,9,10 and 12 are about a two way wireless communication system for simultaneous transmission and reception of information signals in the same frequency band while in group II, the independent claim 11 and 14 are about a two-way signal or information transmission configured to utilize DSL signal standards and DSL hardware such as DSLAM and DSL modems, comprised of a telephone central office. The applicant's attorney, Mr. Michael Ananian, called the examiner on 07/21/2006 and asked if it is possible to cancel group II and put groups I and III together since groups I and III are in same class but different subclasses. The examiner talked to Mr. Philip Sobutka who looked at the case and agreed with the applicant's attorney, but told the examiner to call the applicant's attorney to cancel claim 15 because there is a potential reference has been found to reject claim 15. The examiner called the applicant's attorney and both have agreed to select group I and II and cancel claim 15 .